

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Applicants express their appreciation to Examiner Suglo for the courtesy of an in-person interview on Wednesday, September 22, 2010. During the interview, we provided the Examiner with an advance copy of the revised drawings that are being submitted with this response. We used the drawings to explain use of counting in multiple passes to improve system resolution.

Our discussion of claim language focused on claims 1, 2 and 14. Applicants have cancelled claim 1 in this amendment and incorporated the new wording into claim 2. During the interview, we discussed the ever-changing view of what language is required to satisfy quality control staff that a claim complies with Section 101 requirements. We agreed to change the wording to specify “counting with a counter”, which is a hardware counter and has now been incorporated into claim 2 and does not change the scope of the claim. Of course, a register or other hardware counter is always required to implement counting. This amendment is tangential to patentability and intended primarily to save review personnel the need to review the specification in the course of approving these claims as being tied to scanning equipment in which a deflector and surface being scanned, relative to one another.

In claim 2, we noted that the position of multiple sweeps is actually pseudo-random, rather than purely random. In physical systems, it is difficult to accomplish purely random relationships. Use of unsynchronized clocks, such as clocks with 25 ns and 21.143 ns periods, would be better described as pseudo random, than random. We also noted that a “rectangular distribution” is sometimes referred to as a uniform distribution. This amendment slightly broadens and does not narrow the claims.

Regarding claim 14, the Examiner indicated that it would be unnecessary to amend these article of manufacture claims to avoid the cross-reference to method claims. She said that the PTO considers these claims to change the class of a claim, rather than spanning two classes. We appreciate her explanation of this distinction. We agreed to amend claim 14 to make it clear that the article of manufacture is in a non-transitory storage medium, such as a volatile or non-volatile memory, disk, tape, etc. This claim is not intended to cover software in a signal, before it is fixed in a memory.